

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA  
AT BLUEFIELD

DELORES L. KNIGHT,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:20-00407

M.E. REHERMAN, Warden,  
FPC Alderson,

Defendant.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER**

By Standing Order, this action was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Cheryl A. Eifert for submission of findings and recommendations regarding disposition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). Magistrate Judge Eifert submitted to the court her Findings and Recommendation ("PF&R") on March 30, 2021, in which she recommended that the district court deny plaintiff's petitions under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, grant defendant's request for dismissal, and remove this matter from the court's docket.

In accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b), the parties were allotted fourteen days, plus three mailing days, in which to file any objections to Magistrate Judge Eifert's Findings and Recommendation. The failure of any party to file such objections constitutes a waiver of such party's right to a de novo review by this court. Snyder v. Ridenour, 889 F.2d 1363 (4th Cir. 1989).

The parties failed to file any objections to the Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation within the seventeen-day period.\* Having reviewed the Findings and Recommendation filed by Magistrate Judge Eifert, the court adopts the findings and recommendations contained therein. Accordingly, the court hereby **DENIES** plaintiff's petitions under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, grants defendant's request for dismissal, and directs the Clerk to remove this case from the court's active docket.

Additionally, the court has considered whether to grant a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c). A certificate will not be granted unless there is "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). The standard is satisfied only upon a showing that reasonable jurists would find that any assessment of the constitutional claims by this court is debatable or wrong and that any dispositive procedural ruling is likewise debatable. Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683-84 (4th Cir. 2001). The court concludes that the governing standard is not satisfied in this instance. Accordingly, the court **DENIES** a certificate of appealability.

---

\*Approximately six months after the PF&R was filed, plaintiff filed a motion to dismiss for lack of jurisdiction. See ECF No. 16. That motion is **DENIED**.

The Clerk is directed to forward a copy of this  
Memorandum Opinion and Order to plaintiff and counsel of record.

**IT IS SO ORDERED** this 19th day of September, 2022.

ENTER:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David A. Faber", is written over a horizontal line.

David A. Faber

Senior United States District Judge